

meal will come from. People are afraid to leave their homes.

And so for those reasons, as well as the following—this amendment would also slash refugee assistance being used at this very moment to evacuate and resettle the U.S. allies and partners who served alongside Americans in the War on Terror.

Likewise, Senator PAUL is proposing we rescind the funding that supports important bipartisan priorities like promoting regional security, countering Chinese influence, and ending this pandemic.

And that is not all. The amendment also jeopardizes funds being used to recover and secure U.S. military equipment.

We may no longer be funding the Afghan National Army, but we still urgently need these repurposed funds to keep American equipment out of the wrong hands.

In short, Senator PAUL's amendment could undermine U.S. national security; it would abandon the Afghan people in their darkest hour; and it would betray the American people's commitment to supporting our Afghan allies.

Finally, let me just say that this body overwhelmingly supports the swift passage of Iron Dome. Despite what others may have said, even on this floor, Democrats in the Senate are not holding up this critical funding. In the House, there may have been a very small handful of bipartisan opposition. And the only reason it is being held up in this body is because of this amendment. He is not a member of the Democratic caucus.

This is a defensive, lifesaving system built on years of cooperation with our ally Israel. I am disappointed we are in this situation. But because of all of these reasons, I must object to the Senator's substitute amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection to the modification is heard.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to withdrawing the request?

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I think it is very clear, and very important that it be very clear, that I have offered to fully pay for the Iron Dome system with an extra billion dollars. The objection is coming from the Democrat side. They are objecting to it being paid for.

We have offered this fund of \$6 billion. We have offered to modify it and make it less so there will still be some remaining money in this system. We have offered other funds. We have offered a basically open invitation to the other side that we just think it ought to be paid for. So the objection from the other side is to paying for Iron Dome, to paying for the billion dollars.

Interestingly, aid is already going to Afghanistan while the Taliban is in charge. Now, allegedly, that aid is going to charitable organizations. But the history of the Taliban has been to withhold, control, manipulate, and corrupt charitable organizations as well.

I think it is a mistake to have money already flowing into the new government under the Taliban and to charitable organizations because it basically makes their job easier. It will make the public more pacified if they are being fed by the Western world. They wouldn't be as happy if the money is destroyed in this chaos. So, really, in some ways, you do help to stabilize the Taliban by sending more money there.

But Secretary Blinken was asked this very question in committee by myself: Can you guarantee the \$6 billion will not be released at any time to the Taliban?

And he said no; the implication being that if the Taliban behaves, he sees this \$6 billion going to the Taliban. I think it is a big mistake.

This is a big issue. Iron Dome is a big issue, but it is also a big issue whether we send money to the Taliban. They already have \$80 billion worth of our weapons. I think it will be a real big mistake to send money indirectly or directly to the Taliban so I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Let me just simply say, this is a figleaf.

We could have, today, passed Iron Dome as the House of Representatives passed it, send \$1 billion, and make sure that Israelis and Palestinians would be safer as a result of the terrifying actions that Hamas and others take. There is no reason for this.

I know my colleague has not been particularly supportive on foreign aid in general, and in this case in particular, but the reality is that we have an opportunity here.

Now, I am convinced that Iron Dome will get done. We will get the resources to our allies, the State of Israel. But it is a shame that we have to have the uncertainty that is pending as a result of the objection that has been had.

We don't need to find a pathway in this particular way, which, you know, is only going to undermine our own national security interests as it relates to Afghanistan.

With that I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I request that I am able to make my remarks prior to the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF JONATHAN EUGENE MEYER

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I rise in support of Jonathan Meyer's nomination to be general counsel at the Department of Homeland Security, or DHS.

Mr. Meyer understands the unique challenges facing DHS, and he has the legal and management experience and vision needed to succeed in this important role. Throughout the confirmation process, Mr. Meyer has demonstrated that he understands the complex legal

issues facing DHS and the importance of ensuring the Department cooperates with congressional oversight.

DHS has not had a Senate-confirmed general counsel for over 2 years. DHS needs qualified, Senate-confirmed leaders in place to effectively carry out its critical mission of safeguarding our Nation. Mr. Meyer is an accomplished lawyer and dedicated public servant who is well qualified to serve as the Department's chief legal officer.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the confirmation of Jonathan Meyer to be general counsel for DHS.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jonathan Eugene Meyer, of Ohio, to be General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security.

VOTE ON MEYER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Meyer nomination?

Mr. CARDIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 403 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Portman
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Rosen
Booker	King	Sanders
Brown	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cantwell	Leahy	Schumer
Capito	Lujan	Shaheen
Cardin	Manchin	Sinema
Carper	Markey	Smith
Casey	Menendez	Stabenow
Coons	Merkley	Tester
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murray	Warner
Durbin	Ossoff	Warnock
Gillibrand	Padilla	Warren
Hassan	Paul	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Peters	Wyden

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Cruz	Kennedy
Blackburn	Daines	Lankford
Blunt	Ernst	Lee
Boozman	Fischer	Lummis
Braun	Graham	Marshall
Burr	Grassley	McConnell
Cassidy	Hagerty	Moran
Collins	Hawley	Murkowski
Cornyn	Hoeben	Risch
Cotton	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Cramer	Inhofe	Rounds
Crapo	Johnson	Rubio